

Docket Nos.: 01-0525 & 01-0625 (Cons.)
Bench Date: 02-06-02
Deadline: 03-01-02

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Commission

FROM: John D. Albers, Administrative Law Judge

DATE: January 23, 2002

SUBJECT: Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company

Petition for approval of Residential Delivery Services Implementation Plan under 220 ILCS 5/16-105.

Petition for Approval of Residential Delivery Service Tariffs; and Modification of Sheets of Delivery Service Terms and Conditions Under 220 ILCS 5/16-108.

RECOMMENDATION: Enter the attached Order approving the residential delivery services implementation plan and tariffs.

On August 1, 2001 and September 28, 2001, Mt. Carmel Public Utility Company ("Mt. Carmel") filed petitions seeking approval of its residential delivery services implementation plan and residential delivery services tariffs, respectively. The earlier filing was identified as Docket No. 01-0525 while the latter was identified as Docket No. 01-0625. These dockets have been consolidated. Only Mt. Carmel and Commission Staff actively participated in these proceedings. There are no contested issues in these dockets. The attached Order approves Mt. Carmel's implementation plan and authorizes and directs Mt. Carmel to file residential delivery services tariffs and certain other tariff sheets modifying delivery services terms and conditions.

Mt. Carmel used a historical test year consisting of the 12 months ending December 31, 2000. The overall delivery services revenue requirement adopted in the Order is \$4,670,868. Of this amount, \$2,251,347 represents Mt. Carmel's residential delivery services revenue requirement. The overall cost of capital for residential delivery services is 10.75%. The residential delivery services tariffs are identical in form to Mt. Carmel's tariff for residential customers taking bundled electric service. The residential delivery services tariffs provide for a customer charge of \$5.21 and an energy delivery charge of \$0.03487 per kilowatt-hour.

The only outstanding issue at the end of the evidentiary hearing was whether Mt. Carmel should be required to accept electronic signatures on Letters of Agency

provided by an Alternative Retail Electric Supplier. Staff favored the acceptance of electronic signatures as a means of encouraging the entry of marketers into the residential market. Mt. Carmel was not comfortable with the legality of accepting electronic signatures. To resolve the matter, Staff recommended that Mt. Carmel be exempted from any requirement that it accept electronic signatures at this time. Staff relies on the Commission's exemption of Mt. Carmel from certain requirements in the Commission's "Uniformity Docket," Docket No. 00-0494, to justify its exemption recommendation. Mt. Carmel accepts Staff's recommended exemption.

The deadline for Commission action on the implementation plan is March 2, 2002 while the deadline for action on the tariffs is April 1, 2002.

JDA